

# Exponential Bounds for Convergence of Entropy Rate Approximations and Rate of Memory Loss in Hidden Markov Models Satisfying a Path-Mergeability Condition

Nicholas F. Travers \*

## Abstract

A hidden Markov model (HMM) is said to have *path-mergeable states* if for any two states  $i, j$  there exists a word  $w$  and state  $k$  such that it is possible to transition from both  $i$  and  $j$  to  $k$  while emitting  $w$ . We show that for a finite HMM with path-mergeable states the block estimates of the entropy rate converge exponentially fast, and also that the initial state is almost surely forgotten at an exponential rate.

## 1 Introduction

Hidden Markov models (HMMs) are generalizations of Markov chains in which the underlying Markov state sequence  $(S_t)$  is observed through a noisy or lossy channel, leading to a (typically) non-Markovian output process  $(X_t)$ . They were first introduced in the 50s as abstract mathematical models [1–3], but have since been applied quite successfully in a number of contexts for modeling, such as speech recognition [4–7] and bioinformatics [8–12].

One of the earliest major questions in the study of HMMs [3] was to determine the entropy rate of the output process:

$$h = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H(X_n | X_1, \dots, X_{n-1})$$

Somewhat surprisingly perhaps, in comparison with the case of Markov chains, this turns out to be quite difficult. Even for finite HMMs no general closed form expression is known, and it is widely believed that no such formula exists. A nice integral expression was provided in [3], but it is with respect to an invariant density that is not directly computable.

In practice, the entropy rate  $h$  is instead often estimated simply by the finite-block approximations:

$$h(n) = H(X_n | X_1, \dots, X_{n-1})$$

as in [13]. Thus, it is important to know about the rate of convergence to ensure the quality of these estimates.

No general bounds are known. However, in reference [14] a good exponential upper bound on the rate of convergence is shown for finite, functional HMMs with strictly positive transition probabilities. In [15, 16] we have also demonstrated (by quite different methods) exponential convergence for finite, unifilar, edge-emitting HMMs. Here we prove exponential convergence for finite HMMs (both state-emitting and edge-emitting) satisfying the following simple path-mergeability property: *For each pair of distinct states  $i, j$  there exists a word  $w$  and state  $k$  such that it is possible to transition from both  $i$  and  $j$  to  $k$  while emitting  $w$ .*

Additionally, we show that a finite HMM satisfying this path-mergeability property will a.s. forget its initial condition, and do so at an exponential rate. Similar questions on the rate of memory loss in state-emitting HMMs have also been studied by several other authors, for instance [17–25], but primarily in the

---

\*Complexity Sciences Center and Department of Mathematics, University of California, Davis.  
E-mail - [ntravers@math.ucdavis.edu](mailto:ntravers@math.ucdavis.edu)

case where the observed process  $(X_t)$ , as well as sometimes the underlying state space, are continuous. And often with specifically Gaussian noise in the observations. So, the questions are intuitively quite similar, but the technicalities tend to differ considerably. Though, we will comment more on these relations in the discussion in Section 6.

Our general method of proof (both for establishing bounds on the convergence of the entropy rate estimates and rate of memory loss) is closely related to the original coupling argument used in [14], but is somewhat more involved because our path-mergeability assumption is weaker than the strict positivity of state transitions assumed in that work. The main additional step is to apply large deviation estimates to a reverse-time generation process to show that there exists a set of “good” length- $(t + 1)$  sequences  $G_t$  of combined probability  $1 - O(\text{exponentially small})$ , for which a coupling method like that in [14] may be applied.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the formal framework for our results, including more complete definitions for hidden Markov models and their various properties, as well as the entropy rate and its finite-block estimates. In Section 3 we define two important auxiliary probability spaces that will be necessary for our proofs. In Section 4 we provide proofs of our exponential convergence results for edge-emitting HMMs satisfying the path-mergeability property. In Section 5 we use the edge-emitting results to establish analogous results for state-emitting HMMs. Finally, in Section 6 we discuss relations to previous work and conditions assumed by other authors in more detail, as well as some possible extensions of the current results.

## 2 Definitions and Notation

### 2.1 The Entropy Rate and Finite-Block Estimates

**Definition 1.** For a discrete random variable  $X$  with probability mass function  $p(x)$ , the entropy  $H(X)$  is:

$$H(X) \equiv - \sum_x p(x) \log_2 p(x)$$

**Definition 2.** For discrete random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  with joint probability mass function  $p(x, y)$ , the conditional entropy  $H(X|Y)$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} H(X|Y) &\equiv \sum_y p(y) \cdot H(X|Y = y) \\ &= - \sum_y p(y) \sum_x p(x|y) \log_2 p(x|y) \end{aligned}$$

In these definitions, and throughout this paper, we adopt the standard information theoretic convention  $0 \cdot \log(0) = 0$ , obtained by extending the function  $\xi \log(\xi)$  to the point  $\xi = 0$  by continuity. Intuitively, the entropy  $H(X)$  is the amount of uncertainty in predicting  $X$ , or equivalently, the amount of information obtained by observing  $X$ . The conditional entropy  $H(X|Y)$  is the average uncertainty in predicting  $X$  given the observation of  $Y$ . These quantities satisfy the relations:

$$0 \leq H(X|Y) \leq H(X)$$

For a stationary process  $(X_t)$ , the entropy rate is simply the asymptotic per symbol entropy.

**Definition 3.** Let  $(X_t)$  be a discrete time stationary stochastic process over a finite alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$ . The entropy rate  $h$  is:

$$h \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H(X_1^n)/n ,$$

where  $X_1^n = X_1, \dots, X_n$  is interpreted as a single discrete random variable taking values in the cross product alphabet  $\mathcal{X}^n$ .

Using stationarity it may be shown that this limit  $h$  always exists and is approached monotonically from above. Further, it may be shown, that the entropy rate may also be expressed as the monotonic limit of the conditional next symbol entropies  $h(n)$ :

$$h(n) \searrow h ,$$

where

$$h(n) \equiv H(X_n | X_1^{n-1}) .$$

The block estimates  $H(X_1^n)/n$  can approach no faster than a rate of  $1/n$ . However, the conditional block estimates  $h(n) = H(X_n | X_1^{n-1})$  can approach much more quickly, and are therefore generally more useful. One of our primary goals is to establish an exponential bound on the rate of approach for a suitable class of HMMs (defined below).

## 2.2 Hidden Markov Models

We will consider here only finite HMMs, meaning that both the internal state set  $\mathcal{S}$  and output alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$  are finite. There are two primary types: *state-emitting* and *edge-emitting*. The state-emitting variety is the simpler of the two, and also the more commonly studied, so we introduce them first. However, our primary focus will be on edge-emitting HMMs because the path-mergeability condition we study, as well as the block presentation of Section 4.2.1 used in the proofs, are both more natural in this context.

**Definition 4.** A state-emitting hidden Markov model is a 4-tuple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{O})$  where:

- $\mathcal{S}$  is a finite set of states.
- $\mathcal{X}$  is a finite alphabet of output symbols.
- $\mathcal{T}$  is an  $|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{S}|$  stochastic state transition matrix:  $\mathcal{T}_{ij} = \mathbb{P}(S_{t+1} = j | S_t = i)$ .
- $\mathcal{O}$  is an  $|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{X}|$  stochastic observation matrix:  $\mathcal{O}_{ix} = \mathbb{P}(X_t = x | S_t = i)$ .

The state sequence  $(S_t)$  for a state-emitting HMM is generated according to the Markov kernel  $\mathcal{T}$ , and the observed sequence  $(X_t)$  has conditional distribution defined by the observation matrix  $\mathcal{O}$ :

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n^m = x_n^m | S_0^\infty = s_0^\infty) = \mathbb{P}(X_n^m = x_n^m | S_n^m = s_n^m) = \prod_{t=n}^m \mathcal{O}_{s_t x_t} ,$$

where we denote  $X_n^m = X_n X_{n+1} \dots X_m$  and  $S_n^m = S_n S_{n+1} \dots S_m$  for integers  $n \leq m$ , and extend in the natural way to the case  $m = \infty$ .

An important special case is when the observation matrix is deterministic, and the symbol  $X_t$  is simply a function of the state  $S_t$ . This type of HMMs, known as *functional HMMs* or *functions of Markov chains*, are perhaps the most simple variety conceptually, and also were the first type to be heavily studied. The integral expression for the entropy rate provided in [3] and exponential bound on the convergence of the estimates  $h(n)$  established in [14] both dealt with HMMs of this type.

**Definition 5.** A functional hidden Markov model is a state-emitting hidden Markov model for which the observation matrix  $\mathcal{O}$  is deterministic:  $\mathcal{O}_{ix} = \mathbb{1}_{\{f(i)=x\}}$ , for some function  $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ . It is canonically represented as a 4-tuple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T}, f)$ .

Edge-emitting HMMs are an alternative representation in which the symbol  $X_t$  depends not simply on the current state  $S_t$  but also the next state  $S_{t+1}$ , or rather the transition between them.

**Definition 6.** An edge-emitting hidden Markov model is a 3-tuple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{\mathcal{T}^{(x)}\})$  where:

- $\mathcal{S}$  is a finite set of states.
- $\mathcal{X}$  is a finite alphabet of output symbols.
- $\mathcal{T}^{(x)}, x \in \mathcal{X}$  are  $|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{S}|$  sub-stochastic symbol-labeled transition matrices whose sum  $\mathcal{T}$  is stochastic.  $\mathcal{T}_{ij}^{(x)}$  is the probability of transitioning from  $i$  to  $j$  on symbol  $x$ .

Visually, one can depict an edge-emitting HMM as a directed graph with labeled edges. The vertices are the states, and for each  $i, j, x$  with  $\mathcal{T}_{ij}^{(x)} > 0$  there is directed edge from  $i$  to  $j$  labeled with the transition probability  $p = \mathcal{T}_{ij}^{(x)}$  and symbol  $x$ . The sum of the probabilities on all outgoing edges from each state is 1.

The operation of the HMM is as follows: From the current state  $S_t$  the HMM picks an outgoing edge  $E_t$  according to their probabilities, generates the symbol  $X_t$  labeling this edge, and then follows the edge to the next state  $S_{t+1}$ . Thus we have the conditional measure:

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{t+1} = j, X_t = x | S_t = i, S_0^{t-1} = s_0^{t-1}, X_0^{t-1} = x_0^{t-1}) = \mathbb{P}(S_{t+1} = j, X_t = x | S_t = i) = \mathcal{T}_{ij}^{(x)}$$

for any  $i \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , and possible length- $t$  joint past  $(s_0^{t-1}, x_0^{t-1})$  which may precede state  $i$ . From this it follows, of course, that the state sequence  $(S_t)$  is indeed a Markov chain with transition kernel  $\mathcal{T} = \sum_x \mathcal{T}^{(x)}$ .

**Remark.** It is implicitly assumed (for a HMM of any type) that each symbol  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  may be actually be generated with positive probability. That is, for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , there exists  $i \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(X_0 = x | S_0 = i) > 0$ . Otherwise, the symbol  $x$  is useless and the alphabet can be restricted to  $\mathcal{X}/\{x\}$ . It also assumed, throughout, that the state set  $\mathcal{S}$  and output alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$  both have size at least two. Otherwise, the conclusions are essentially trivial in all cases, but some of the proofs and definitions may be ambiguous as they are written.

### 2.2.1 Irreducibility and Stationary Measures

A HMM, either state-emitting or edge-emitting, is said to be *irreducible* if the underlying Markov chain over states with transition kernel  $\mathcal{T}$  is irreducible. In this case, there exists a unique *stationary distribution*  $\pi$  over the states satisfying  $\pi = \pi\mathcal{T}$ , and the joint state-symbol sequence  $(S_t, X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  with initial state  $S_0$  drawn according to  $\pi$  is itself a stationary process. We will henceforth assume all HMMs are irreducible, and denote by  $\mathbb{P}$  the (unique) stationary measure on joint state-symbol sequences satisfying  $S_0 \sim \pi$ .

This measure  $\mathbb{P}$  will be our primary focus. However at times, in particular for studying the rate of memory loss in the initial condition, we will also consider the situation in which the initial state  $S_0$  is chosen according to some alternative distribution. We denote by  $\mathbb{P}_i$  the measure on the joint sequences  $(S_t, X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  given by fixing  $S_0 = i$ , and by  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$  the measure given by choosing  $S_0$  according to the distribution  $\mu$ :

$$\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot | S_0 = i) \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_\mu(\cdot) = \sum_i \mu_i \mathbb{P}_i(\cdot)$$

These measures  $\mathbb{P}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_i$ , and  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$  are, of course, also extendable in a natural way to biinfinite sequences  $(S_t, X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  as oppose to one-sided sequences  $(S_t, X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , and we will do so as necessary.

### 2.2.2 Equivalence of Model Types

Though they are indeed different objects state-emitting, edge-emitting, and functional HMMs are all equivalent in the following sense: Given an irreducible HMM  $M$  of any of these types there exists an irreducible HMM  $M'$  of any of the other types such that stationary output processes  $(X_t)$  for the two HMMs  $M$  and  $M'$  are equal in distribution. The equivalence is also constructive in that  $M'$  can always be constructed from  $M$ . We recall below the standard conversions.

1. *Functional to State-Emitting* - Since a functional HMM is a state-emitting HMM (with deterministic observation matrix) no conversion is necessary.

2. *State-Emitting to Edge-Emitting* - If  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{O})$  then  $M' = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{\mathcal{T}'^{(x)}\})$ , where  $\mathcal{T}'_{ij}{}^{(x)} = \mathcal{T}_{ij}\mathcal{O}_{jx}$ .
3. *Edge-Emitting to Functional* - If  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{\mathcal{T}^{(x)}\})$  then  $M' = (\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T}', f')$ , where  $\mathcal{S}' = \{(i, x) : \sum_j \mathcal{T}_{ij}^{(x)} > 0\}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}'_{(i,x)(j,y)} = \left(\mathcal{T}_{ij}^{(x)} / \sum_k \mathcal{T}_{ik}^{(x)}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_k \mathcal{T}_{jk}^{(y)}\right)$ , and  $f'(i, x) = x$ .

By composition of these three conversion algorithms one may convert from any of the HMM varieties to any of the other varieties. This equivalence of model types, and specifically the conversion algorithms, will be useful when considering extensions of our results for edge-emitting HMMs to state-emitting HMMs in Section 5.

### 2.2.3 Path-Mergeability

For a HMM  $M$ , let  $\delta_i(w)$  be the states  $j$  which state  $i$  can transition to upon emitting the word  $w$ :

$$\delta_i(w) \equiv \{j \in \mathcal{S} : \mathbb{P}_i(X_0^{|w|-1} = w, S_{|w|} = j) > 0\}, \quad \text{for an edge-emitting HMM}$$

$$\delta_i(w) \equiv \{j \in \mathcal{S} : \mathbb{P}_i(X_1^{|w|} = w, S_{|w|} = j) > 0\}, \quad \text{for a state-emitting HMM}$$

where  $|w|$  denotes the length of  $w$ . In either case, if  $w$  is the null word  $\lambda$  then  $\delta_i(w) \equiv \{i\}$ , for each  $i$ . The following two properties will be of central interest.

**Definition 7.** *A HMM is said to have path-mergeable states (or be path-mergeable) if for each pair of states  $i, j$  there exists some word  $w$  and state  $k$  such that it is possible to transition from both  $i$  and  $j$  to  $k$  on  $w$ :  $k \in \delta_i(w)$  and  $k \in \delta_j(w)$ .*

**Definition 8.** *A HMM is said to be state-collapsible if for each state  $k$  there exists some symbol  $x$ , such that if the symbol  $x$  is observed then it is possible to collapse to state  $k$  at the next time step, regardless of the previous state distribution:  $k \in \delta_i(x)$ , for all  $i$  with  $\delta_i(x) \neq \{\}$ .*

Our end goal in Section 4, below, is to prove exponential bounds on convergence of the entropy rate estimates  $h(n)$  and rate of memory loss in edge-emitting HMMs with path-mergeable states. To do so, however, we will first similar prove similar bounds for edge-emitting HMMs under the state-collapsible hypothesis, and then bootstrap. As we show in Section 4.2.1, if an edge-emitting HMM has path-mergeable states then some “power of it” is state-collapsible. Thus, exponential convergence bounds for state-collapsible (edge-emitting) HMMs pass to exponential bounds for path-mergeable (edge-emitting) HMMs by considering block presentations. In Section 5 we will also consider similar questions for state-emitting HMMs. In this case, analogous convergence results follow easily from the results for edge-emitting HMMs by applying the standard state-emitting to edge-emitting conversion.

### 2.2.4 Loss of Memory

Let  $\phi_i(w)$  denote the probability distribution over the current state given that the initial state  $S_0$  is state  $i$ , and the first  $|w|$  symbols of output for the HMM are, in fact, the word  $w$ :

$$\phi_i(w) \equiv \mathbb{P}_i(S_{|w|} | X_0^{|w|-1} = w), \quad \text{for an edge-emitting HMM}$$

$$\phi_i(w) \equiv \mathbb{P}_i(S_{|w|} | X_1^{|w|} = w), \quad \text{for a state-emitting HMM}$$

Also denote, analogously,  $\phi_\mu(w)$  as the conditional distribution over the current state given that the initial state  $S_0$  is chosen according to the distribution  $\mu$ , and the first  $|w|$  output symbols are the word  $w$ . And, let  $\phi(w) = \phi_\pi(w)$ . In the case that that the word  $w$  cannot be generated from the initial state  $S_0 = i$  (or distribution  $\mu$ ), we take, by convention,  $\phi_i(w)$  (or  $\phi_\mu(w)$ ) to be the non-distribution consisting of all 0s.

An important property of HMMs is the so called *forgetting of the initial condition* or *loss of memory*.

**Definition 9.** An edge-emitting HMM is said to a.s. forget its initial condition if for each initial state  $i$ :

$$\|\phi_i(X_0^{t-1}) - \phi(X_0^{t-1})\|_{TV} \rightarrow 0, \mathbb{P}_i \text{ a.s.}$$

where  $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\|\mu - \nu\|_1$  is the total variational norm of two finite probability distributions  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$  and  $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ . An edge-emitting HMM is said to a.s. forget its initial condition at an exponential rate if there exists some  $0 < \alpha < 1$  such that for each initial state  $i$ :

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\phi_i(X_0^{t-1}) - \phi(X_0^{t-1})\|_{TV}^{1/t} \leq \alpha, \mathbb{P}_i \text{ a.s.}$$

Definitions for state-emitting HMMs are analogous with  $X_0^{t-1}$  replaced by  $X_1^t$ .

Forgetting of the initial condition is closely related to convergence of the finite-block entropy rate estimates  $h(n)$  for the stationary output process of a HMM. Indeed, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have:

$$h \geq H(X_{n-1}|S_0, X_0^{n-2}), \text{ for an edge-emitting HMM}$$

$$h \geq H(X_n|S_0, X_1^{n-1}), \text{ for a state-emitting HMM}$$

Thus:

$$h(n) - h \leq H(X_{n-1}|X_0^{n-2}) - H(X_{n-1}|S_0, X_0^{n-2}), \text{ for an edge-emitting HMM} \quad (1)$$

$$h(n) - h \leq H(X_n|X_1^{n-1}) - H(X_n|S_0, X_1^{n-1}), \text{ for a state edge-emitting HMM} \quad (2)$$

If the initial state  $S_0$  is almost forgotten (with high probability) after the first  $n-1$  output symbols then the next symbol does not depend too much (with high probability) on the initial state  $S_0$ , and the differences in the averaged conditional entropies on the right hand sides of Equations 1 and 2 are each small.

**Remark.** An equivalent definition (used, for example, in [23] for state-emitting HMMs) is to require convergence (or exponential convergence) of the total variational distance  $\|\phi_\nu(X_1^t) - \phi_\mu(X_1^t)\|_{TV}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_\nu$  a.s. for any initial state distribution  $\mu$  with full support and arbitrary initial state distribution  $\nu$ . A HMM will a.s. forget its initial condition (at exponential rate  $\alpha$ ) in this sense, if and only if it a.s. forgets its initial condition in the sense of Definition 9 (at exponential rate  $\alpha$ ). A stronger condition is to require a.s. convergence, or exponential convergence, for any two initial distributions  $\mu, \nu$  without requiring  $\mu$  to have full support. We feel, however, that this is too stringent a requirement, since it implies that the set of allowed future sequences which can be generated from each initial state  $i$  is the same.

### 2.2.5 Additional Notation

For a HMM  $M$  with output alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$  and word  $w \in \mathcal{X}^*$  we define:

$$\mathbb{P}_i(w) \equiv \mathbb{P}_i(X_0^{|w|-1} = w)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(w) \equiv \mathbb{P}_\mu(X_0^{|w|-1} = w)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(w) \equiv \mathbb{P}(X_0^{|w|-1} = w)$$

The process language  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P})$  for the output process  $\mathcal{P} = (X_t)$  of the HMM is the set of words  $w$  of positive probability.  $\mathcal{L}_L(\mathcal{P})$  is the set of length- $L$  words in the process language. The support of the process  $\mathcal{P}$ , denoted  $\text{supp}(\mathcal{P})$ , is the set of all bi-infinite sequences such that every finite subsequence is in the process language. Finally,  $\text{supp}(\mathcal{P}^-)$  is the set of all infinite pasts sequences such that every finite subsequence is in the process language.

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}) \equiv \{w \in \mathcal{X}^* : \mathbb{P}(w) > 0\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_L(\mathcal{P}) \equiv \{w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}) : |w| = L\}$$

$$\text{supp}(\mathcal{P}) \equiv \{x_{-\infty}^\infty : x_n^m \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}) \text{ for all } n \leq m\}$$

$$\text{supp}(\mathcal{P}^-) \equiv \{x_{-\infty}^{-1} : x_n^m \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}) \text{ for all } n \leq m \leq -1\}$$

For  $w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P})$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(w)$  is the set of states which can generate  $w$ , and  $\mathcal{S}(w, j)$  is the set of states which can transition to  $j$  on  $w$ . We will only need to apply these definitions for edge-emitting in which case they may be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{S}(w) \equiv \{i \in \mathcal{S} : \mathbb{P}_i(w) > 0\} \quad (\text{edge-emitting})$$

$$\mathcal{S}(w, j) \equiv \{i \in \mathcal{S} : \mathbb{P}_i(X_0^{|w|-1} = w, S_{|w|} = j) > 0\} \quad (\text{edge-emitting})$$

We will also use the following (perhaps slightly nonstandard) notation for distributions of random variable blocks and conditional distributions.

- The distribution of the block of random variables  $X_n^m$  according to the stationary measure  $\mathbb{P}$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{P}(X_n^m)$ , and similarly  $\mathbb{P}_i(X_n^m)$  and  $\mathbb{P}_\mu(X_n^m)$  denote the distributions of the random variable block  $X_n^m$  according to the measures  $\mathbb{P}_i$  and  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ . Thus, a statement like  $\mathbb{P}_i(X_n^m) = \mathbb{P}_j(X_n^m)$  means that the distribution of the random variables  $X_n^m$  from initial states  $i$  and  $j$  are equal. A similar notation is used for distributions of state sequence blocks  $S_n^m$  and joint state-symbol blocks  $(S_n^m, X_n^m)$ .
- As in the definition of  $\phi_i(w)$  for an edge-emitting HMM,  $\mathbb{P}_i(S_t | X_0^{t-1} = x_0^{t-1})$  is the conditional distribution of the random variable  $S_t$  given that the initial state is  $S_0 = i$  and  $X_0^{t-1} = x_0^{t-1}$ .  $\mathbb{P}_i(S_t | X_0^{t-1})$  denotes the distribution-valued random variable for the conditional distribution over the state  $S_t$  given initial state  $i$  and (random) output sequence  $X_0^{t-1}$ .
- $x_n^m$  and  $s_n^m$  will normally be used to represent realizations of the random variable blocks  $X_n^m$  and  $S_n^m$ , but they should be thought of more generally just as length- $(m - n + 1)$  symbol or state sequences without a specific starting point in time. So, for example,  $\mathbb{P}_i(x_n^m) = \mathbb{P}_i(X_0^{m-n} = x_n^m)$ , applying the definition of  $\mathbb{P}_i(w)$  to the word  $w = x_n^m$ . (This could also be interpreted as  $\mathbb{P}_i(x_n^m) = \mathbb{P}_i(X_n^m = x_n^m)$ , but this is NOT what we mean, unless  $n = 0$ .)

### 3 Auxiliary Spaces

The random variables  $S_t$  and  $X_t$  for a HMM are assumed to live on an underlying probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . We define now two important auxiliary probability spaces that will be useful in our proofs later on. Throughout Section 3 we assume that  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{T^{(x)}\})$  is a state-collapsible, edge-emitting HMM, and denote the special state-collapsing symbol for state  $k$  by  $y_k$ :  $k \in \delta_i(y_k)$ , for all  $i$  with  $\delta_i(y_k) \neq \{\}$ .

#### 3.1 The Pair Chain Coupling Space $(\widehat{\Omega}, \widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{\mathbb{P}})$

For fixed states  $k, \widehat{k}$  and a symbol sequence  $x_0^t \in \mathcal{X}^{t+1}$  ( $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ) such that  $\mathbb{P}_k(x_0^t) > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\widehat{k}}(x_0^t) > 0$  the *pair chain coupling space*  $(\widehat{\Omega}, \widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{\mathbb{P}})$  is defined as follows:

- $\widehat{\Omega} = \{(r_0^{t+1}, \widehat{r}_0^{t+1}) : r_\tau, \widehat{r}_\tau \in \mathcal{S} \text{ for } 0 \leq \tau \leq t+1\}$  is the set of length- $(t+2)$  state sequence pairs.
- $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$  is the discrete  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\widehat{\Omega}$  (i.e. all subsets of  $\widehat{\Omega}$  are measurable).
- The measure  $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$  on state sequence pairs  $(r_0^{t+1}, \widehat{r}_0^{t+1}) \in \widehat{\Omega}$  is the pull back measure of the time-inhomogeneous Markov chain  $(R_\tau, \widehat{R}_\tau)_{\tau=0}^{t+1}$  with initial distribution

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_0 = k, \widehat{R}_0 = \widehat{k}) = 1$$

and transition probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_{\tau+1} = j, \widehat{R}_{\tau+1} = \widehat{j} | R_\tau = i, \widehat{R}_\tau = \widehat{i}) \\ = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = j | S_\tau = i, X_\tau^t = x_\tau^t) \cdot \mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = \widehat{j} | S_\tau = \widehat{i}, X_\tau^t = x_\tau^t), & \text{if } i \neq \widehat{i} \\ \mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = j | S_\tau = i, X_\tau^t = x_\tau^t), & \text{if } i = \widehat{i} \text{ and } j = \widehat{j} \\ 0, & \text{if } i = \widehat{i} \text{ and } j \neq \widehat{j} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

for  $0 \leq \tau \leq t$ .

By marginalizing it follows that the state sequences  $(R_\tau)$  and  $(\hat{R}_\tau)$  are each individually (time-inhomogeneous) Markov chains with transition probabilities

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbb{P}}(R_{\tau+1} = j | R_\tau = i) &= \mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = j | S_\tau = i, X_\tau^t = x_\tau^t), \text{ and} \\ \hat{\mathbb{P}}(\hat{R}_{\tau+1} = \hat{j} | \hat{R}_\tau = \hat{i}) &= \mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = \hat{j} | S_\tau = \hat{i}, X_\tau^t = x_\tau^t).\end{aligned}$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbb{P}}(R_0^{t+1} = r_0^{t+1}) &= \mathbb{P}(S_0^{t+1} = r_0^{t+1} | S_0 = k, X_0^t = x_0^t), \text{ and} \\ \hat{\mathbb{P}}(\hat{R}_0^{t+1} = \hat{r}_0^{t+1}) &= \mathbb{P}(S_0^{t+1} = \hat{r}_0^{t+1} | S_0 = \hat{k}, X_0^t = x_0^t).\end{aligned}$$

So we have the following coupling bound:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi_k(x_0^t) - \phi_{\hat{k}}(x_0^t)\|_{TV} &\equiv \|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1} | X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{k}}(S_{t+1} | X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \\ &\leq \hat{\mathbb{P}}(R_{t+1} \neq \hat{R}_{t+1})\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

### 3.2 The Reverse-Time Generation Space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$

Fix a state  $k$ , and assume without loss of generality (up to relabeling) that the output alphabet is  $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{X}|\}$  with  $y_k = 1$ . We construct the *reverse-time generation space*  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  and random variables  $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in -\mathbb{N}}$  for state  $k$  as follows:

- $(\tilde{U}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\tilde{V}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are i.i.d. sequences of uniform  $([0, 1])$  random variables independent of one another.
- $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  is the canonical probability space (path space) on which the sequences  $(\tilde{U}_n)$  and  $(\tilde{V}_n)$  are defined.
- On this space  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  we define random partitions  $\tilde{P}_t, t \in -\mathbb{N}$  of the interval  $[0, 1]$  and random variables  $\tilde{X}_t, t \in -\mathbb{N}$  inductively as follows:
  1.  $\tilde{P}_{-1} = \{\tilde{I}_{-1}^x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$  where each  $\tilde{I}_{-1}^x$  is an interval of length  $\mathbb{P}(X_{-1} = x)$ , and the intervals are consecutively placed on  $[0, 1]$  and closed at the right endpoint. For example, if  $\mathbb{P}(X_{-1} = 1) = 1/2$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(X_{-1} = 2) = 1/3$ , and  $\mathbb{P}(X_{-1} = 3) = 1/6$  then  $\tilde{I}_{-1}^1 = [0, 1/2]$ ,  $\tilde{I}_{-1}^2 = (1/2, 5/6]$ , and  $\tilde{I}_{-1}^3 = (5/6, 1]$ .  $\tilde{X}_{-1}$  is defined by  $\tilde{X}_{-1} = x \Leftrightarrow \tilde{U}_1 \in \tilde{I}_{-1}^x$ .
  2. Conditioned on  $\tilde{X}_{t+1}^{-1} = x_{t+1}^{-1}$  (for  $t \leq -2$ ),  $\tilde{P}_t = \{\tilde{I}_t^x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$  where the  $\tilde{I}_t^x$ 's are intervals of length  $\mathbb{P}(X_t = x | X_{t+1}^{-1} = x_{t+1}^{-1})$  placed consecutively on  $[0, 1]$  and closed at the right endpoint, and:
    - If  $t + 1 = \tilde{T}_n^k$  for some  $n$ , then  $\tilde{X}_t$  is defined by  $\tilde{X}_t = x \Leftrightarrow \tilde{V}_n \in \tilde{I}_t^x$ .
    - Otherwise,  $\tilde{X}_t$  is defined by  $\tilde{X}_t = x \Leftrightarrow \tilde{U}_{-t} \in \tilde{I}_t^x$ .

Here the random stopping times  $\tilde{T}_n^k, n \in \mathbb{N}$  are defined by:

- $\tilde{T}_1^k = \max\{t \leq -1 : \mathbb{P}(X_t^{-1} = \tilde{X}_t^{-1} | S_t = k) \geq \mathbb{P}(X_t^{-1} = \tilde{X}_t^{-1} | S_t = j), \text{ for all } j\}$
- $\tilde{T}_2^k = \max\{t < \tilde{T}_1^k : \mathbb{P}(X_t^{-1} = \tilde{X}_t^{-1} | S_t = k) \geq \mathbb{P}(X_t^{-1} = \tilde{X}_t^{-1} | S_t = j), \text{ for all } j\}$
- $\tilde{T}_3^k = \max\{t < \tilde{T}_2^k : \mathbb{P}(X_t^{-1} = \tilde{X}_t^{-1} | S_t = k) \geq \mathbb{P}(X_t^{-1} = \tilde{X}_t^{-1} | S_t = j), \text{ for all } j\}$
- ...

If there is no such  $t$  for some  $n \geq 1$ , then  $\tilde{T}_n^k \equiv -\infty$  and  $\tilde{T}_m^k \equiv -\infty$  for all  $m > n$ .

By induction on the length of  $w$  it is easily seen that  $\mathbb{P}\left(X_{-|w|}^{-1} = w\right) = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left(\tilde{X}_{-|w|}^{-1} = w\right)$  for any word  $w \in \mathcal{X}^*$ . Hence:

$$(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in -\mathbb{N}} \stackrel{d.}{=} (X_t)_{t \in -\mathbb{N}} \quad (4)$$

## 4 Results for Edge-Emitting HMMs

With the necessary preliminaries established, we now proceed to the proofs of exponential convergence of the finite-block entropy rate approximations and exponential rate of memory loss for edge-emitting HMMs with path-mergeable states. The basic structure of the arguments is as follows:

1. We establish exponential bounds for state-collapsible HMMs.
2. We extend to path-mergeable HMMs by passing to a power machine representation (see Section 4.2.1).

Exponential convergence for state-collapsible HMMs is established by the following steps:

- (i) Using large deviation estimates on the  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  space we show that there exists a set of “good” length- $(t+1)$  sequences  $G_t$  of combined probability  $1 - O(\text{exponentially small})$ , such that for each  $x_0^t \in G_t$  there is some state  $k$  with  $N_k(x_0^t) \geq c_1 \cdot t$ . Here  $c_1 > 0$  is a constant (depending on the HMM, but not on  $t$ ), and

$$N_k(x_0^t) \equiv \left| \{0 \leq \tau \leq t-1 : x_\tau = y_k, \mathbb{P}_k(x_{\tau+1}^t) \geq \mathbb{P}_j(x_{\tau+1}^t) \text{ for all } j\} \right|. \quad (5)$$

- (ii) Using a coupling argument similar to that given in [14] we show that  $\|\phi_k(x_0^t) - \phi_{\hat{k}}(x_0^t)\|_{TV}$  is exponentially small, for any sequence  $x_0^t \in G_t$  and states  $k, \hat{k}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_k(x_0^t) > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{k}}(x_0^t) > 0$ .
- (iii) Applying the Borel-Cantelli Lemma we conclude from (i) and (ii) that the initial condition is a.s. forgotten at an exponential rate.
- (iv) Using (ii) we also show that the difference  $H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t, S_0)$  is exponentially small for any  $x_0^t \in G_t$ .
- (v) Using (iv) and the fact that  $\mathbb{P}(G_t^c)$  is exponentially small we show that the difference  $H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t, S_0)$  is exponentially small.
- (vi) Finally, using (v) and the fact that  $H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t, S_0) \leq h$ , for all  $t$  we conclude that the differences  $h(t) - h$  must be exponentially small.

### 4.1 Under State-Collapsible Assumption

Throughout Section 4.1 we assume  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{T^{(x)}\})$  is a state-collapsible, edge-emitting HMM, and denote the special state-collapsing symbol for state  $j$  by  $y_j$ :  $j \in \delta_i(y_j)$ , for all  $i$  with  $\delta_i(y_j) \neq \{\}$ . We define also the quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} p_j &\equiv \mathbb{P}(X_0 = y_j | S_1 = j) \quad \text{and} \quad p_* \equiv \min_j p_j \\ q_j &\equiv \min_{i \in \mathcal{S}(y_j)} \mathbb{P}_i(S_1 = j | X_0 = y_j) \quad \text{and} \quad q_* \equiv \min_j q_j \\ r_* &\equiv \min_{i,j} \pi_i / \pi_j \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $p_*$ ,  $q_*$ , and  $r_*$  are all always strictly positive.

#### 4.1.1 Large Deviation Estimates for the Space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$

Let the random variables  $\tilde{Z}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\tilde{Z}_n^{avg}, n \in \mathbb{N}$  on  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  be defined by:

$$\tilde{Z}_n \equiv \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \tilde{V}_n \leq p_* r_* / |\mathcal{S}|, \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\tilde{Z}_n^{avg} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \tilde{Z}_m.$$

Also, define the random fractions  $\tilde{F}_n^k, n \in \mathbb{N}$  by:

$$\tilde{F}_n^k \equiv \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } \tilde{T}_n^k = -\infty \\ c/n, & \text{if } \tilde{T}_n^k > -\infty \text{ where } c = |\{t \leq -1 : t = \tilde{T}_m^k \text{ for some } 1 \leq m \leq n \text{ and } \tilde{X}_{t-1} = y_k\}| \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 1.**  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left(\tilde{Z}_n^{avg} \leq \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}\right) \leq \alpha_1^n$ , where  $\alpha_1 \equiv \exp\left(-\frac{p_*^2 r_*^2}{2|\mathcal{S}|^2}\right) < 1$ .

*Proof.* The  $\tilde{Z}_n$  are i.i.d. with  $0 \leq \tilde{Z}_n \leq 1$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\tilde{Z}_n = \frac{p_* r_*}{|\mathcal{S}|}$ . Thus, applying Hoeffding's inequality to the i.i.d. sequence  $\tilde{Z}_n$  yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left(\tilde{Z}_n^{avg} \leq \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}\right) &= \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left(\tilde{Z}_n^{avg} - \frac{p_* r_*}{|\mathcal{S}|} \leq -\frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{-2\left(\frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}\right)^2}{(1-0)^2} \cdot n\right) \\ &= \alpha_1^n \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.** Let  $w \in \mathcal{L}_L(\mathcal{P})$  be a word such that:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{-L}^{-1} = w | S_{-L} = k) \geq \mathbb{P}(X_{-L}^{-1} = w | S_{-L} = j), \text{ for all } j$$

Then:

- (i)  $\mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = k | X_{-L}^{-1} = w) \geq r_* \cdot \mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = j | X_{-L}^{-1} = w)$ , for all  $j$
- (ii)  $\mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = k | X_{-L}^{-1} = w) \geq r_* / |\mathcal{S}|$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_{-L}^{-1} = w | S_{-L} = k) &\geq \mathbb{P}(X_{-L}^{-1} = w | S_{-L} = j) \\ \implies \mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = k | X_{-L}^{-1} = w) \cdot \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{-L}^{-1} = w)}{\mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = k)} &\geq \mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = j | X_{-L}^{-1} = w) \cdot \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{-L}^{-1} = w)}{\mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = j)} \\ \implies \mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = k | X_{-L}^{-1} = w) &\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = k)}{\mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = j)} \cdot \mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = j | X_{-L}^{-1} = w) \geq r_* \cdot \mathbb{P}(S_{-L} = j | X_{-L}^{-1} = w) \end{aligned}$$

This proves (i), and (ii) follows. □

**Lemma 3.** If  $\tilde{T}_m^k > -\infty$  and  $\tilde{Z}_m = 1$ , then  $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{T}_m^k-1} = y_k$ .

*Proof.* Note that for any  $t \leq -1$  the event  $\{\tilde{T}_m^k = t\}$  depends only on  $\tilde{X}_t^{-1}$ . Define:

$$\mathcal{L}_m^k \equiv \{x_t^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}) : t \leq -1, \text{ and } \tilde{X}_t^{-1} = x_t^{-1} \implies \tilde{T}_m^k = t\}$$

Then for any  $x_t^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}_m^k$  we have by Lemma 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_{t-1} = y_k | X_t^{-1} = x_t^{-1}) &\geq \mathbb{P}(S_t = k | X_t^{-1} = x_t^{-1}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_{t-1} = y_k | S_t = k) \\ &\geq \frac{r_*}{|\mathcal{S}|} \cdot p_* \end{aligned}$$

But,

$$\tilde{Z}_m = 1 \implies \tilde{V}_m \leq \frac{p_* r_*}{|\mathcal{S}|}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_t^{-1} = x_t^{-1} \text{ and } \tilde{Z}_m = 1 &\implies \tilde{V}_m \in [0, \mathbb{P}(X_{t-1} = y_k | X_t^{-1} = x_t^{-1})] = \tilde{I}_{t-1}^{y_k} \\ &\implies \tilde{X}_{t-1} = y_k \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for any  $x_t^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}_m^k$  the claim follows. □

**Lemma 4.** *If  $\tilde{T}_n^k > -\infty$  and  $\tilde{Z}_n^{avg} > \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}$ , then  $\tilde{F}_n^k > \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $\tilde{T}_n^k > -\infty$ . Then, by Lemma 3,  $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{T}_m^k-1} = y_k$  for each  $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\tilde{Z}_m = 1$ . So:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_n^k &= \frac{1}{n} \left| \{1 \leq m \leq n : \tilde{X}_{\tilde{T}_m^k-1} = y_k\} \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n} \left| \{1 \leq m \leq n : \tilde{Z}_m = 1\} \right| \\ &= \tilde{Z}_n^{avg} \end{aligned}$$

Hence:

$$\tilde{T}_n^k > -\infty \text{ and } \tilde{Z}_n^{avg} > \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \implies \tilde{F}_n^k > \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}$$

□

**Lemma 5.**  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \left\{ \tilde{T}_n^k > -\infty \text{ and } \tilde{F}_n^k \leq \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \right\} \right) \leq \alpha_1^n$

*Proof.* By Lemmas 1 and 4 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \left\{ \tilde{T}_n^k > -\infty \text{ and } \tilde{F}_n^k \leq \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \right\} \right) &\leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \left\{ \tilde{T}_n^k > -\infty \text{ and } \tilde{Z}_n^{avg} \leq \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \left\{ \tilde{Z}_n^{avg} \leq \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \alpha_1^n \end{aligned}$$

□

#### 4.1.2 Bound from Below on $\mathbb{P}(G_t)$

The random variables  $\tilde{T}_n^k$  and  $\tilde{F}_n^k$  on  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  depend only on the symbol sequence  $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in -\mathbb{N}}$ :  $\tilde{T}_n^k = \tilde{T}_n^k(\tilde{X}_{-\infty}^{-1})$  and  $\tilde{F}_n^k = \tilde{F}_n^k(\tilde{X}_{-\infty}^{-1})$ . As such, we may define corresponding random variables  $T_n^k$  and  $F_n^k$  for the standard HMM probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , depending on  $(X_t)_{t \in -\mathbb{N}}$ . Since  $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in -\mathbb{N}} \stackrel{d.}{=} (X_t)_{t \in -\mathbb{N}}$  we have, necessarily,  $(\tilde{T}_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \stackrel{d.}{=} (T_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\tilde{F}_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \stackrel{d.}{=} (F_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . This will be quite useful in the following development.

Before proceeding, however, we first need to introduce some more notation and terminology. We say  $x_{-\infty}^{-1}$  is an *extension* of the word  $w$  if  $x_{-|w|}^{-1} = w$ . We define the constant  $c_1 = \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|^2}$ , and for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  we define  $n_t = \lceil t/|\mathcal{S}| \rceil$  and  $N_k(x_0^t)$  as in Equation (5). Finally, we define the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^k &\equiv \left\{ x_{-\infty}^{-1} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}^-) : T_n^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) > -\infty \text{ and } F_n^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) \leq \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \right\}, \quad k \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N} \\ B_n &\equiv \left\{ x_{-\infty}^{-1} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}^-) : F_n^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) > \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}, \text{ for all } k \text{ with } T_n^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) > -\infty \right\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \\ C_t &\equiv \left\{ x_{-\infty}^{-1} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}^-) : \text{there exists } k \text{ with } T_{n_t}^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) \geq -t \text{ and } F_{n_t}^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) > \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \right\}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N} \\ C'_t &\equiv \{ x_{-t-1}^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}_{t+1}(\mathcal{P}) : \text{extensions of } x_{-t-1}^{-1} \text{ are in } C_t \}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N} \\ G_t &\equiv \{ x_0^t \in \mathcal{L}_{t+1}(\mathcal{P}) : \text{there exists } k \text{ with } N_k(x_0^t) \geq c_1 t \}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N} \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $C'_t$  and  $G_t$  may both be considered simply as sets of length- $(t+1)$  words  $w$ . For  $C'_t$  there is the added interpretation of the words as length- $(t+1)$  past sequences, and for  $G_t$  there is the added interpretation of the words as length- $(t+1)$  future sequences. However,  $C'_t$  and  $G_t$  are both well defined simply as sets of words. As such, we may reasonably ask questions about when one set is contained in another, and the probability of these sets as the combined (stationary) probability of all words in the sets.

**Lemma 6.** *For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :*

- (i)  $\mathbb{P}(A_n^k) \leq \alpha_1^n$ , for each  $k$
- (ii)  $\mathbb{P}(B_n) \geq 1 - |\mathcal{S}| \alpha_1^n$

*Proof.* (i) Follows from Lemma 5 and Equation (4). (ii) follows from (i) and the fact that the compliment of the set  $B_n$  is  $B_n^c = \bigcup_k A_n^k$ . (Note: Compliment here means compliment with respect to the set of sequences  $\text{supp}(\mathcal{P}^-)$ , i.e.  $B_n \cup B_n^c = \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}^-)$ . The combined probability of all other sequences is 0, so they can be ignored.)  $\square$

**Lemma 7.**  $C_t \supseteq B_{n_t}$

*Proof.* For any  $x_{-\infty}^{-1} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{P}^-)$  there is some  $k$  such that  $T_{n_t}^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) \geq -t$ . And, for any  $x_{-\infty}^{-1} \in B_{n_t}$  with  $T_{n_t}^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) \geq -t > -\infty$ , we have  $F_{n_t}^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) > \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}$ , which implies  $x_{-\infty}^{-1} \in C_t$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.**  $G_t \supseteq C'_t$

*Proof.* Let  $w \in C'_t$ . Then there exists  $k$  such that:

$$T_{n_t}^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) \geq -t \text{ and } F_{n_t}^k(x_{-\infty}^{-1}) > \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|}$$

for any extension  $x_{-\infty}^{-1}$  of  $w$  in  $\text{supp}(\mathcal{P}^-)$ . It follows that:

$$N_k(w) > n_t \cdot \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|} \geq \left( \frac{p_* r_*}{2|\mathcal{S}|^2} \right) t = c_1 t,$$

which implies  $w \in G_t$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 9.** For any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(G_t) \geq 1 - |\mathcal{S}|\alpha_2^t$ , where  $\alpha_2 \equiv \alpha_1^{1/|\mathcal{S}|} < 1$ .

*Proof.* By Lemmas 6, 7, and 8 we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(G_t) \geq \mathbb{P}(C'_t) = \mathbb{P}(C_t) \geq \mathbb{P}(B_{n_t}) \geq 1 - |\mathcal{S}|\alpha_1^{n_t} \geq 1 - |\mathcal{S}|\alpha_2^t$$

□

#### 4.1.3 Pair Chain Coupling Bound

Assume now, without loss of generality, that the state set is  $\mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$ , and for  $x_0^t \in G_t$  let the index  $l(x_0^t)$  and time set  $\Gamma(x_0^t)$  be defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} l &\equiv \min\{k : N_k(x_0^t) \geq c_1 t\} \\ \Gamma &\equiv \{0 \leq \tau \leq t-1 : x_\tau = y_l, \mathbb{P}_l(x_{\tau+1}^t) \geq \mathbb{P}_j(x_{\tau+1}^t) \text{ for all } j\} \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 10.** For any  $x_0^t \in G_t$ ,  $\tau \in \Gamma(x_0^t)$ , and  $i \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_i(x_\tau^t) > 0$ :

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = l | S_\tau = i, X_\tau^t = x_\tau^t) \geq q_*$$

*Proof.* Fix  $x_0^t \in G_t$  and  $\tau \in \Gamma(x_0^t)$ . For any state  $i$  with  $\mathbb{P}_i(x_\tau^t) > 0$  we have that  $\mathbb{P}_i(x_\tau) = \mathbb{P}_i(y_l) > 0$ , and:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{\tau+1}^t = x_{\tau+1}^t | S_\tau = i, X_\tau = y_l) \leq \mathbb{P}(X_{\tau+1}^t = x_{\tau+1}^t | S_{\tau+1} = l)$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = l | S_\tau = i, X_\tau^t = x_\tau^t) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = l, S_\tau = i, X_\tau = y_l, X_{\tau+1}^t = x_{\tau+1}^t)}{\mathbb{P}(S_\tau = i, X_\tau = y_l, X_{\tau+1}^t = x_{\tau+1}^t)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_\tau = i, X_\tau = y_l) \cdot \mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = l | S_\tau = i, X_\tau = y_l) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_{\tau+1}^t = x_{\tau+1}^t | S_{\tau+1} = l)}{\mathbb{P}(S_\tau = i, X_\tau = y_l) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_{\tau+1}^t = x_{\tau+1}^t | S_\tau = i, X_\tau = y_l)} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+1} = l | S_\tau = i, X_\tau = y_l) \\ &\geq q_* \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 11.** For any  $x_0^t \in G_t$  and states  $k, \hat{k}$  with  $\mathbb{P}_k(x_0^t) > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{k}}(x_0^t) > 0$ :

$$\|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1} | X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{k}}(S_{t+1} | X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \leq \alpha_3^t,$$

where  $\alpha_3 \equiv (1 - q_*^2)^{c_1} < 1$ .

*Proof.* Applying the pair chain coupling bound (3) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{k}}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \\
& \leq \widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_{t+1} \neq \widehat{R}_{t+1}) \\
& = \prod_{\tau=0}^t \widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_{\tau+1} \neq \widehat{R}_{\tau+1} | R_\tau \neq \widehat{R}_\tau) \\
& \leq \prod_{\tau \in \Gamma(x_0^t)} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_{\tau+1} \neq \widehat{R}_{\tau+1} | R_\tau \neq \widehat{R}_\tau) \\
& \leq \prod_{\tau \in \Gamma(x_0^t)} \max_{i, \widehat{i} \in \mathcal{S}(x_\tau^t), i \neq \widehat{i}} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_{\tau+1} \neq \widehat{R}_{\tau+1} | R_\tau = i, \widehat{R}_\tau = \widehat{i}) \\
& \leq \prod_{\tau \in \Gamma(x_0^t)} \max_{i, \widehat{i} \in \mathcal{S}(x_\tau^t), i \neq \widehat{i}} \left(1 - \widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_{\tau+1} = \widehat{R}_{\tau+1} = l | R_\tau = i, \widehat{R}_\tau = \widehat{i})\right) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \prod_{\tau \in \Gamma(x_0^t)} (1 - q_*^2) \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} (1 - q_*^2)^{c_1 t} \\
& = \alpha_3^t,
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 10 and (b) from the fact that  $|\Gamma(x_0^t)| \geq c_1 t$ . (Note: We have assumed here that  $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_\tau \neq \widehat{R}_\tau) > 0$ , for all  $0 \leq \tau \leq t$ . If this is not the case the conclusion follows trivially.)  $\square$

#### 4.1.4 Forgetting of the Initial Condition

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $x_0^t$  be a length- $(t+1)$  sequence with  $\mathbb{P}_k(x_0^t) > 0$ . Then:*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \leq \max_{\widehat{k} \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t)} \|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{k}}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV}$$

*Proof.* It is equivalent to prove the statement for 1-norms, in which case we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_1 \\
& = \left\| \mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \sum_{\widehat{k} \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t)} \mathbb{P}(S_0 = \widehat{k} | X_0^t = x_0^t) \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{k}}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) \right\|_1 \\
& \leq \sum_{\widehat{k} \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t)} \mathbb{P}(S_0 = \widehat{k} | X_0^t = x_0^t) \cdot \|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{k}}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_1 \\
& \leq \max_{\widehat{k} \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t)} \|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{k}}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_1
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Theorem 1.** *Any state-collapsible, edge-emitting HMM forgets its initial condition a.s. at exponential rate  $\alpha_3$  or faster. For each state  $i$ :*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\phi_i(X_0^{t-1}) - \phi(X_0^{t-1})\|_{TV}^{1/t} \leq \alpha_3, \quad \mathbb{P}_i \text{ a.s.}$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbb{P}(\cdot) = \sum_i \pi_i \mathbb{P}_i(\cdot)$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_i(E) \leq \mathbb{P}(E)/\pi_i \leq \mathbb{P}(E)/(\min_j \pi_j)$  for any state  $i$  and measurable event  $E$ . Hence, by Lemma 9, we have for any state  $i$ :

$$\mathbb{P}_i(G_i^c) \leq c_2 \alpha_2^t, \text{ where } c_2 \equiv \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{\min_j \pi_j}.$$

So, by the Borel-Cantelli Lemma,  $\mathbb{P}_i(\{x_0^\infty : x_0^t \in G_t^c \text{ i.o.}\}) = 0$ . And, for  $x_0^t \in G_t$  with  $\mathbb{P}_i(x_0^t) > 0$  we have by Lemmas 11 and 12:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_i(x_0^t) - \phi(x_0^t)\|_{TV} &\equiv \|\mathbb{P}_i(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \\ &\leq \max_{\hat{i} \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t)} \|\mathbb{P}_i(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{i}}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \\ &\leq \max_{k, \hat{k} \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t)} \|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{k}}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \\ &\leq \alpha_3^t \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows.  $\square$

#### 4.1.5 Convergence of Entropy Rate Approximations

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$  and  $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  be two probability measures on a finite set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . If  $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon$  for some  $0 < \epsilon < 1/e$  then:*

$$|H(\mu) - H(\nu)| \leq n\epsilon \log_2(1/\epsilon)$$

*Proof.* Recall that, for a logarithm of any base, we use the convention  $0 \cdot \log(0) \equiv 0$ , obtained by continuous extension of the function  $x \log(x)$  to the point  $x = 0$ . Let us also define  $0 \cdot \log(1/0) \equiv 0$ , by continuous extension of the function  $x \log(1/x) = -x \log(x)$  to the point  $x = 0$ .

Further, applying these conventions, let us define for any  $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$  the function  $f_\epsilon(x) : [0, 1 - \epsilon] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by:

$$f_\epsilon(x) = (x + \epsilon) \ln(x + \epsilon) - x \ln(x)$$

It is easily checked that for  $\epsilon \in [0, 1/e]$ :

$$\max_{x \in [0, 1 - \epsilon]} |f_\epsilon(x)| = |f_\epsilon(0)| = \epsilon \ln(1/\epsilon)$$

Now, if  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are two distributions such that  $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon$ , for some  $0 < \epsilon < 1/e$ , then  $|\mu_k - \nu_k| \leq \epsilon$  for all  $k$ . Using this, the bound on  $|f_\epsilon|$ , and the fact that  $g(x) = x \ln(1/x)$  is increasing on  $[0, 1/e]$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |H(\mu) - H(\nu)| &= \left| \sum_k \nu_k \log_2(\nu_k) - \mu_k \log_2(\mu_k) \right| \\ &\leq \log_2(e) \cdot \sum_k |\nu_k \ln(\nu_k) - \mu_k \ln(\mu_k)| \\ &\leq n \log_2(e) \cdot \max_{\epsilon' \in [0, \epsilon]} \max_{x \in [0, 1 - \epsilon']} |(x + \epsilon') \ln(x + \epsilon') - x \ln(x)| \\ &= n \log_2(e) \cdot \max_{\epsilon' \in [0, \epsilon]} \max_{x \in [0, 1 - \epsilon']} |f_{\epsilon'}(x)| \\ &\leq n \log_2(e) \max_{\epsilon' \in [0, \epsilon]} \epsilon' \ln(1/\epsilon') \\ &= n \log_2(e) \cdot \epsilon \ln(1/\epsilon) \\ &= n\epsilon \log_2(1/\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Lemma 14.** *For  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , let  $t_0 = t_0(\alpha) \equiv \lceil \log_\alpha(1/e) \rceil$ . Then for any  $t \geq t_0$  and any two probability measures  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$  and  $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  on the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \leq \alpha^t$ :*

$$|H(\mu) - H(\nu)| \leq -n \log_2(\alpha) \cdot t \alpha^t$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  be two distributions with  $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} = \epsilon \leq \alpha^t$ , for some  $t \geq t_0$ . Since  $\alpha^t \leq 1/e$  for  $t \geq t_0$ , and the function  $x \log_2(1/x)$  is increasing on  $[0, 1/e]$ , we have by Lemma 13:

$$\begin{aligned} |H(\mu) - H(\nu)| &\leq n\epsilon \log_2(1/\epsilon) \\ &\leq n\alpha^t \log_2(1/\alpha^t) \\ &= -n \log_2(\alpha) \cdot t\alpha^t \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 15.** *Let  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  be two distributions on  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then  $\|\mathbb{P}_\mu(X_0) - \mathbb{P}_\nu(X_0)\|_{TV} \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}$ .*

*Proof.* It is equivalent to prove the statement for 1-norms. In this case we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{P}_\mu(X_0) - \mathbb{P}_\nu(X_0)\|_1 &= \left\| \sum_k \mu_k \cdot \mathbb{P}_k(X_0) - \sum_k \nu_k \cdot \mathbb{P}_k(X_0) \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \sum_k |\mu_k - \nu_k| \cdot \|\mathbb{P}_k(X_0)\|_1 \\ &= \|\mu - \nu\|_1 \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 16.** *For  $t \geq t_0 = t_0(\alpha_3)$  (as defined in Lemma 14) and  $x_0^t \in G_t$ :*

$$H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|S_0, X_0^t = x_0^t) \leq -|\mathcal{X}| \log_2(\alpha_3) \cdot t\alpha_3^t$$

*Proof.* Let  $x_0^t \in G_t$  with  $t \geq t_0$ . By Lemma 11 we have:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{k}}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \leq \alpha_3^t, \text{ for all } k, \hat{k} \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t).$$

Thus, by Lemma 12:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_k(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}(S_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \leq \alpha_3^t, \text{ for all } k \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t).$$

By Lemma 15 this implies:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_k(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - \mathbb{P}(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t)\|_{TV} \leq \alpha_3^t, \text{ for all } k \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t).$$

Hence, applying Lemma 14 we have the bound:

$$H(X_{t+1}|X_0 = x_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t, S_0 = k) \leq -|\mathcal{X}| \log_2(\alpha_3) \cdot t\alpha_3^t, \text{ for all } k \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t).$$

The claim follows from this bound and the fact that:

$$\begin{aligned} &H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|S_0, X_0^t = x_0^t) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}(x_0^t)} \mathbb{P}(S_0 = k|X_0^t = x_0^t) \cdot (H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t, S_0 = k)) \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 17.** *Let  $\alpha_4 \equiv \max\{\alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$ . Then  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t, S_0)\}^{1/t} \leq \alpha_4$ .*

*Proof.* Applying Lemmas 9 and 16 we have that for all  $t \geq t_0 = t_0(\alpha_3)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t, S_0) &= \sum_{x_0^t \in \mathcal{L}_{t+1}(\mathcal{P})} \mathbb{P}(x_0^t) \cdot [H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t = x_0^t, S_0)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(G_t) \cdot \{-|\mathcal{X}| \log_2(\alpha_3) \cdot t\alpha_3^t\} + \mathbb{P}(G_t^c) \cdot \log_2 |\mathcal{X}| \\ &\leq 1 \cdot \{-|\mathcal{X}| \log_2(\alpha_3) \cdot t\alpha_3^t\} + |\mathcal{S}| \alpha_2^t \cdot \log_2 |\mathcal{X}| \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows directly from this estimate.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** *For any state-collapsible, edge-emitting HMM:*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{h(t) - h\}^{1/t} \leq \alpha_4$$

*Proof.* For any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$h = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} H(X_0|X_{-\tau}^{-1}) \geq \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} H(X_0|X_{-\tau}^{-1}, S_{-(t+1)}) = H(X_0|X_{-(t+1)}^{-1}, S_{-(t+1)}) = H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t, S_0)$$

Thus:

$$h(t+2) - h = H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t) - h \leq H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t) - H(X_{t+1}|X_0^t, S_0)$$

The claim follows directly from this inequality and Lemma 17.  $\square$

## 4.2 Under Path-Mergeable Assumption

Building on the results of the previous section for state-collapsible HMMs, we now proceed to the proofs of exponential convergence of the entropy rate approximations and exponential rate of memory loss for path-mergeable HMMs. The general approach is as follows:

- (i) We show that for any path-mergeable HMM  $M$  there is some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the power machine  $M^n$  (defined below) is state-collapsible.
- (ii) We combine (i) with the exponential convergence bounds for state-collapsible HMMs (Theorems 1 and 2) to obtain the desired bounds for path-mergeable HMMs.

### 4.2.1 Power Machines

Let  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{\mathcal{T}^{(x)}\})$  be an edge-emitting hidden Markov model with probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  on its output and internal state sequences. The  $n$ -block model or *power machine*  $M^n$  is the triple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{W}, \{\mathcal{Q}^{(w)}\})$  where:

- $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{L}_n(\mathcal{P})$  is the set of length- $n$  words of positive probability.
- $\mathcal{Q}_{ij}^{(w)} = \mathbb{P}_i(X_0^{n-1} = w, S_n = j)$  is the  $n$ -step transition probability from  $i$  to  $j$  on  $w$ .

It can be shown that if  $M$  is irreducible and  $n$  is relatively prime to the period of  $M$ 's graph, then  $M^n$  is also irreducible. Further, in this case  $M$  and  $M^n$  have the same stationary distribution  $\pi$  and the output process of  $M^n$  is the same (i.e. equal in distribution) to the output process for  $M$  when the latter is considered over length- $n$  blocks rather than individual symbols. The following important lemma allows us to reduce questions for path-mergeable HMMs to analogous questions for state-collapsible HMMs by considering such block presentations.

**Lemma 18.** *If  $M$  is an edge-emitting HMM with path-mergeable states, then there exists some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the power machine  $M^n$  is state-collapsible.*

*Proof.* The proof is by explicit construction. Let us denote  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{\mathcal{T}^{(x)}\})$  and assume without loss of generality (up to relabeling) that  $\mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$ . Also, for each pair of states  $i, j$  denote by  $w_{ij}$  and  $k_{ij}$  the special word  $w$  and state  $k$  in the definition of path-mergeability, so that  $k_{ij} \in \delta_i(w_{ij})$  and  $k_{ij} \in \delta_j(w_{ij})$ . Additionally, for each state  $i$ , let  $w_{ii} \equiv \lambda$  (the null word) and  $k_{ii} \equiv i$ . The base collapsing word  $v_*$  and base collapsing state  $i_*$  are defined inductively by the following algorithm:

- (i)  $t := 0, v_0 := \lambda, i_0 := 1, \mathcal{R} := \mathcal{S} \setminus \{1\}$
- (ii) While  $\mathcal{R} \neq \{\}$  do:
  - $k_t := \min\{k : k \in \mathcal{R}\}$
  - $j_t := \min\{j : j \in \delta_{k_t}(v_t)\}$
  - $w_t := w_{i_t j_t}$
  - $v_{t+1} := v_t w_t$
  - $i_{t+1} := k_{i_t j_t}$
  - $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R} / (\{l : \mathbb{P}_l(v_{t+1}) = 0\} \cup \{k_t\})$
  - $t := t + 1$
- (iii)  $v_* := v_t, i_* := i_t$

At each iteration of the loop in step (ii) the set  $\mathcal{R}$  loses at least 1 member, so the loop must terminate after a finite number of steps. If  $v_*$  and  $i_*$  are the word and state in which it terminates, then clearly by the construction  $i_* \in \delta_1(v_*)$ . In addition, since each state  $j \neq 1$  must be removed from the set  $\mathcal{R}$  before the loop terminates, we know that for each state  $j \neq 1$ , either  $\mathbb{P}_j(v_*) = 0$  or  $i_* \in \delta_j(v_*)$ . Thus, all states which can generate  $v_*$  may collapse to  $i_*$  upon generating  $v_*$ .

The path-mergeable states condition implies aperiodicity of the HMM (that is, aperiodicity of the underlying Markov chain). Combined with irreducibility this implies that there exist words  $v'_k, k \in \mathcal{S}$ , all of some fixed length  $L$ , such that  $k \in \delta_{i_*}(v'_k)$ , for each  $k$ . So, for each state  $k$  the word  $u_k \equiv v_* v'_k$  satisfies:

$$k \in \delta_j(u_k), \text{ for all } j \text{ with } \mathbb{P}_j(u_k) > 0.$$

Thus, the power machine  $M^n$  with  $n = |u_k| = |v_*| + L$  is state-collapsible. Note that aperiodicity implies the power machine is well defined for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** The purpose of the above construction is simply to verify that for any edge-emitting HMM with path-mergeable states some power of it will be state-collapsible. It is not to be taken as an optimal construction or a method for determining the minimal power  $n$ . It is relatively easy to check (at least if the number of states and symbols are both small) whether a given HMM is path-mergeable, and it is very easy to check that a given HMM is state-collapsible. Thus, in practice, if one wants actual numerical bounds on the convergence of the entropy rate estimates  $h(n)$  or rate of memory loss for a given HMM  $M$ , it is probably best to first verify that  $M$  is path-mergeable, and then simply construct successive power machines  $M^1 = M, M^2, M^3, \dots$  until the first  $n$  such that  $M^n$  is state-collapsible. With the construction given above  $n$  will always be at least 2, and quite often much larger than necessary. In the (not unusual) case that  $M$  is itself state-collapsible, the theorem of the previous sections can be applied directly, and the estimates given below using the power machine representation are not necessary.

#### 4.2.2 Forgetting of the Initial Condition

Throughout Section 4.2.2  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{\mathcal{T}^{(x)}\})$  is an edge-emitting HMM with path-mergeable states,  $M^n = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{W}, \{\mathcal{Q}^{(w)}\})$  is the corresponding state-collapsible power machine given by Lemma 18 ( $n \geq 2$ ), and  $i \in \mathcal{S}$  is a fixed state.

We take the joint state-output sequence  $(S_t, X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  to be generated according to the measure  $\mathbb{P}_i$  for  $M$ , and define for a given output sequence  $x_0^\infty$  the distributions:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_m &\equiv \phi(x_0^{mn-1}), \quad m \in \mathbb{N} \\ \psi_{i,m} &\equiv \phi_i(x_0^{mn-1}), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}\end{aligned}$$

Also, we define  $\theta_m$ ,  $\mu_m$ , and  $\nu_m$  to be the unique probability distributions on  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfying the relations:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_m &= (1 - \epsilon_m)\theta_m + \epsilon_m\nu_m \\ \psi_{i,m} &= (1 - \epsilon_m)\theta_m + \epsilon_m\mu_m\end{aligned}$$

where  $\epsilon_m \equiv \|\psi_m - \psi_{i,m}\|_{TV}$ .

**Lemma 19.** *Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  be fixed, and let  $\theta$  and  $\nu$  be any two probability distributions on  $\mathcal{S}$ . Define the distribution  $\psi$  by  $\psi = (1 - \epsilon)\theta + \epsilon\nu$ . Let  $w$  be a word of length  $L \geq 1$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_\psi(w) > 0$ . Then:*

$$\phi_\psi(w) = \phi_\theta(w) \left( \frac{(1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{P}_\theta(w)}{(1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{P}_\theta(w) + \epsilon\mathbb{P}_\nu(w)} \right) + \phi_\nu(w) \left( \frac{\epsilon\mathbb{P}_\nu(w)}{(1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{P}_\theta(w) + \epsilon\mathbb{P}_\nu(w)} \right)$$

*Proof.* The proof is a straightforward calculation using Bayes Theorem and The Law of Total Probability.  $\square$

**Lemma 20.** *Let  $t = (mn - 1) + \tau$ , for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\tau \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and let  $x_0^\infty$  be any infinite symbol sequence generated from initial state  $i$ . Then:*

$$\|\phi(x_0^t) - \phi_i(x_0^t)\|_{TV} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m)\mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}, \frac{\epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m)\mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t)} \right\}$$

*Proof.* Applying Lemma 19 we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(x_0^t) &= \phi_{\psi_m}(x_{mn}^t) \\ &= \begin{cases} \phi_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) \left( \frac{(1 - \epsilon_m)\mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m)\mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t)} \right) + \\ \phi_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t) \left( \frac{\epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m)\mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t)} \right) \end{cases} \quad (6)\end{aligned}$$

and:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_i(x_0^t) &= \phi_{\psi_{i,m}}(x_{mn}^t) \\ &= \begin{cases} \phi_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) \left( \frac{(1 - \epsilon_m)\mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m)\mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t)} \right) + \\ \phi_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t) \left( \frac{\epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m)\mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t)} \right) \end{cases} \quad (7)\end{aligned}$$

The claim follows by applying the triangle inequality to (6) and (7), and using the fact that total variational norm between any two probability distributions is at most 1.  $\square$

Now take  $0 < \alpha_3 < 1$  as in Theorem 1 for the state-collapsible power machine  $M^n$ , and let  $\alpha_5$  and  $\alpha_6$  be any real numbers such that  $\alpha_3 < \alpha_5 < \alpha_6 < 1$ . Let  $\alpha_7 \equiv \alpha_6^{1/n}$ , and let  $\alpha_8$  be any real number such that  $\alpha_7 < \alpha_8 < 1$ . Define also the minimum non-zero transition probability:

$$\epsilon_* \equiv \min\{\mathcal{T}_{ij}^{(x)} : \mathcal{T}_{ij}^{(x)} > 0\}$$

constants:

$$\begin{aligned}b_1 &\equiv 1/\alpha_7^n \\ b_2 &\equiv \epsilon_*^n/2\end{aligned}$$

times:

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &\equiv \min\{t \in \mathbb{N} : 1/m^2 \geq 2\alpha_5^m, \text{ for all } m \geq t\} \\ t_2 &\equiv \min\{t \in \mathbb{N} : (\alpha_5^m \cdot m^2)/b_2 \leq \alpha_6^m, \text{ for all } m \geq t\} \\ t_3 &\equiv \min\{t \in \mathbb{N} : (1/\alpha_7^n) \cdot \alpha_7^\tau \leq \alpha_8^\tau, \text{ for all } \tau \geq nt\} \end{aligned}$$

random times:

$$\begin{aligned} T_A &\equiv \min\{t \in \mathbb{N} : \|\Psi_m - \Psi_{i,m}\|_{TV} \leq \alpha_5^m, \forall m \geq t\} \quad (T_A \equiv \infty \text{ if no such } t) \\ T_B &\equiv \min\{t \in \mathbb{N} : (\Psi_{i,m})_{S_{mn}} > 1/m^2, \forall m \geq t\} \quad (T_B \equiv \infty \text{ if no such } t) \\ T_C &\equiv \max\{T_A, T_B, t_1, t_2, t_3\} \end{aligned}$$

and events:

$$A \equiv \{T_A < \infty\}, \quad B \equiv \{T_B < \infty\}, \quad C \equiv A \cap B$$

where  $\Psi_m \equiv \phi(X_0^{mn-1})$ ,  $\Psi_{i,m} \equiv \phi_i(X_0^{mn-1})$ , and  $(\Psi_{i,m})_{S_{mn}}$  is the component of the probability vector  $\Psi_{i,m}$  corresponding to the state  $S_{mn}$ .

**Lemma 21.** *If  $\mathbb{P}_j(w) > 0$  for some state  $j$  and word  $w$  of length  $L \geq 1$ , then  $\mathbb{P}_j(w) \geq \epsilon_*^L$ .*

*Proof.* Denote  $w = w_0 \dots w_{L-1}$ . The claim follows immediately from the decomposition:

$$\mathbb{P}_j(w) = \sum_{s_1^L \in S^L} \mathbb{P}_j(X_0^{L-1} = w_0^{L-1}, S_1^L = s_1^L) = \sum_{s_1^L \in S^L} \prod_{t=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{T}_{s_t s_{t+1}}^{(w_t)},$$

where  $s_0 = j$  in the product. If the sum is nonzero then some term must be nonzero, in which case that term itself, and hence the sum, must be greater than or equal to  $\epsilon_*^L$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 22.**  $\mathbb{P}_i(C) = 1$

*Proof.* We will show that  $\mathbb{P}_i(A) = 1$  and  $\mathbb{P}_i(B) = 1$ . The results then follows directly from the definition  $C = A \cap B$ .

- Claim (1) -  $\mathbb{P}_i(A) = 1$ .

By the relation between the power machine  $M^n$  and base HMM  $M$  we have:

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\Psi_{i,m} - \Psi_m\|_{TV}^{1/m} \leq \alpha_3, \quad \mathbb{P}_i \text{ a.s.}$$

The claim follows from this and the fact that  $\alpha_5 > \alpha_3$ .

- Claim (2) -  $\mathbb{P}_i(B) = 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_i((\Psi_{i,m})_{S_{mn}} \leq 1/m^2) &= \sum_{x_0^{mn-1}} \mathbb{P}_i(x_0^{mn-1}) \sum_k \mathbb{P}_i(S_{mn} = k | X_0^{mn-1} = x_0^{mn-1}) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbb{P}_i(S_{mn}=k | X_0^{mn-1}=x_0^{mn-1}) \leq 1/m^2\}} \\ &\leq \sum_{x_0^{mn-1}} \mathbb{P}_i(x_0^{mn-1}) \sum_k 1/m^2 \\ &= |\mathcal{S}|/m^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the Borel-Cantelli Lemma,  $\mathbb{P}_i((\Psi_{i,m})_{S_{mn}} \leq 1/m^2 \text{ i.o.}) = 0$ , and the claim follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 23.** *If the joint sequence  $(S_t, X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is generated according to the measure  $\mathbb{P}_i$ , then on the event  $C$ :*

$$\|\phi_i(X_0^t) - \phi(X_0^t)\|_{TV} \leq \alpha_8^t, \quad \text{for all } t \geq T_C \cdot n$$

*Proof.* Let  $(x_0^\infty, s_0^\infty)$  be any  $i$ -possible realization of  $(X_0^\infty, S_0^\infty)$  such that the event  $C$  occurs. That is,  $\mathbb{P}_i(X_0^t = x_0^t, S_0^t = s_0^t) > 0$ , for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $t_A, t_B, t_C$  be the corresponding values of the random variables  $T_A, T_B, T_C$  for this realization  $(x_0^\infty, s_0^\infty)$ . For  $t \geq t_C \cdot n$  we may decompose  $t$  as  $t = (mn - 1) + \tau$  for some  $m \geq t_C$  and  $1 \leq \tau \leq n$ . By the definition of  $t_C$ , we know that  $m$  is greater than or equal to each of  $t_1, t_2, t_3, t_A$ , and  $t_B$ . From this and some previous Lemmas we obtain the following series of implications.

- (i)  $m \geq t_A \implies \epsilon_m = \|\psi_m - \psi_{i,m}\|_{TV} \leq \alpha_5^m$
- (ii)  $m \geq t_1 \implies 1/m^2 \geq 2\alpha_5^m \implies \frac{1}{m^2} - \alpha_5^m \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{m^2}$
- (iii)  $m \geq t_B \implies (\psi_{i,m})_{s_{mn}} \geq \frac{1}{m^2} \implies (\theta_m)_{s_{mn}} \geq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon_m} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{m^2} - \epsilon_m\right)$
- (iv) (i) + (ii) + (iii)  $\implies (\theta_m)_{s_{mn}} \geq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon_m} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{m^2} - \alpha_5^m\right) \geq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon_m} \cdot \frac{1}{2m^2}$
- (v) Lemma 21  $\implies \mathbb{P}_{s_{mn}}(x_{mn}^t) \geq \epsilon_*^\tau \geq \epsilon_*^n$ , since  $x_{mn}^t$  is in fact generated from state  $s_{mn}$ .
- (vi) (i) + (iv) + (v)  $\implies (1 - \epsilon_m) \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) \geq (1 - \epsilon_m) \cdot (\theta_m)_{s_{mn}} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{s_{mn}}(x_{mn}^t) \geq \frac{1}{2m^2} \cdot \epsilon_*^n = \frac{b_2}{m^2}$
- (vii) (i)  $\implies \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t) \leq \epsilon_m \leq \alpha_5^m$  and  $\epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t) \leq \epsilon_m \leq \alpha_5^m$
- (viii) (vi) and (vii) together with the fact that  $m \geq t_2$  imply that:

$$\frac{\epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m) \mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t)} \leq \frac{\alpha_5^m}{b_2/m^2 + \alpha_5^m} \leq m^2 \alpha_5^m / b_2 \leq \alpha_6^m$$

and:

$$\frac{\epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m) \mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t)} \leq \frac{\alpha_5^m}{b_2/m^2 + \alpha_5^m} \leq m^2 \alpha_5^m / b_2 \leq \alpha_6^m$$

- (ix) Finally, (viii), Lemma 20, and the fact that  $m \geq t_3$  together imply:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi(x_0^t) - \phi_i(x_0^t)\|_{TV} &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{\epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m) \mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\mu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}, \frac{\epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t)}{(1 - \epsilon_m) \mathbb{P}_{\theta_m}(x_{mn}^t) + \epsilon_m \mathbb{P}_{\nu_m}(x_{mn}^t)} \right\} \\ &\leq \alpha_6^m = \alpha_7^{mn} \leq (1/\alpha_7^n) \cdot \alpha_7^t \leq \alpha_8^t \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for any  $i$ -possible realization  $(s_0^\infty, x_0^\infty)$  such that the event  $C$  occurs the claim is proved.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *Any edge-emitting HMM with path-mergeable states forgets its initial condition a.s. at exponential rate  $\alpha_3^{1/n}$  or faster (where as before  $\alpha_3$  is the memory loss rate for the corresponding state-collapsible power machine  $M^n$  of Lemma 18). That is, for each state  $i$ :*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\phi_i(X_0^{t-1}) - \phi(X_0^{t-1})\|_{TV}^{1/t} \leq \alpha_3^{1/n}, \quad \mathbb{P}_i \text{ a.s.}$$

*Proof.* This follows directly from Lemmas 22 and 23, and the fact that the constant  $\alpha_8$  can be made arbitrarily close to  $\alpha_3^{1/n}$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** By construction the event  $A$  must have probability 1 with respect to the measure  $\mathbb{P}_i$ , and on the event  $A$  we have  $\|\phi(X_0^{mn-1}) - \phi_i(X_0^{mn-1})\|_{TV} \leq \alpha_5^m < \alpha_7^{mn}$ , for all sufficiently large  $m$ . Thus, it is easy to see that a.s. forgetting of the initial condition occurs at an exponential rate along an  $n$ -block subsequence. From this it seems clear that a.s. forgetting should occur on the entire sequence exponentially fast. That is, we should be able to “fill in the gaps”. And indeed we can, at least almost surely. However, it is possible to construct HMMs such that there exist a symbol  $x$  and state distributions  $\psi$  and  $\psi'$  with  $\|\psi - \psi'\|_{TV}$  arbitrarily close to 0,  $\mathbb{P}_\psi(x) > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_{\psi'}(x) > 0$ , and  $\|\phi_\psi(x) - \phi_{\psi'}(x)\|_{TV}$  arbitrarily close to 1. Thus, some care and fairly technical arguments as given above are necessary to fill in the gaps. However, conceptually the basic idea is pretty simple. Though it is possible to have such distributions  $\psi, \psi'$  and symbol  $x$  (or word  $w$ , with  $|w| \leq n$ ), the probability of generating  $x$  (or  $w$ ) from either  $\psi$  or  $\psi'$  is also arbitrarily small. In fact, it is very unlikely (from either  $\psi$  or  $\psi'$ ) even to generate a symbol  $x$  (or word  $w$ ,  $|w| \leq n$ ) which will separate  $\psi$  and  $\psi'$  by very much, if they are already close. So, we can show by Borel-Cantelli that almost surely the event of generating such unusual symbols  $x$  (or words  $w$ ) that will separate the state distributions  $\phi(X_0^{mn-1})$  and  $\phi_i(X_0^{mn-1})$  by too much does not occur infinitely often.

#### 4.2.3 Convergence of Entropy Rate Approximations

**Lemma 24.** Let  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{\mathcal{T}^{(x)}\})$  be a HMM with power machine  $M^n = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{W}, \{\mathcal{Q}^{(w)}\})$ , for some  $n \geq 2$  and relatively prime to  $\text{per}(M)$ . Let  $h$  and  $h(t)$  be the entropy rate and order- $t$  approximation for the output process of  $M$ , and let  $g$  and  $g(t)$  be the entropy rate and order- $t$  approximation for the output process of  $M^n$ . If

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{g(t) - g\}^{1/t} \leq \alpha,$$

for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , then

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{h(t) - h\}^{1/t} \leq \alpha^{1/n}.$$

*Proof.* By definition:

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H(X_1^{nt})}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} n \cdot \frac{H(X_1^{nt})}{nt} = n \cdot h, \text{ and} \\ g(t) &= H\left(X_{n(t-1)+1}^{nt} | X_1^{n(t-1)}\right) = \sum_{\tau=n(t-1)}^{nt-1} H(X_{\tau+1} | X_1^\tau) = \sum_{\tau=n(t-1)}^{nt-1} h(\tau+1). \end{aligned}$$

Combining these relations gives:

$$g(t) - g = \sum_{\tau=n(t-1)}^{nt-1} (h(\tau+1) - h) \geq n \cdot (h(nt) - h)$$

Thus, for any  $\tau = nt$  (with  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ) we have:

$$h(\tau) - h \leq \frac{1}{n} (g(\tau/n) - g)$$

The result follows directly from this inequality and the fact that  $h(\tau)$  is monotonically decreasing.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.** Let  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{\mathcal{T}^{(x)}\})$  be an edge-emitting HMM with path-mergeable states, and let  $h$  and  $h(t)$  be the entropy rate and order- $t$  approximation for its output process. Then:

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{h(t) - h\}^{1/t} \leq \alpha_4^{1/n}$$

where  $0 < \alpha_4 < 1$  is the decay rate (as given in Theorem 2) of the entropy rate approximations for the state-collapsible power machine  $M^n$  (of Lemma 18).

*Proof.* This follows directly from Lemma 24.  $\square$

## 5 Relation to State-Emitting HMMs

In Section 4 we established exponential convergence of the entropy rate approximations  $h(t)$  and an a.s. exponential rate of memory loss for edge-emitting HMMs with path-mergeable states. We now show that these results for edge-emitting HMMs translate directly to analogous results for state-emitting HMMs.

The proofs rely primarily on the state-emitting to edge-emitting conversion algorithm given in Section 2.2.2. For reference, we will denote this conversion algorithm by  $\zeta$ . We will denote also, generally, state-emitting HMMs by  $M_s$  and edge-emitting HMMs by  $M_e$ . We will use  $\mathbb{P}^s$  to denote the stationary probability measure on the joint state-symbol sequence  $(S_t, X_t)$  for a state-emitting HMM  $M_s$ , and  $\mathbb{P}^e$  to denote the stationary probability measure over  $(S_t, X_t)$  for an edge-emitting HMM  $M_e$ .  $\mathbb{P}_i^s$  and  $\mathbb{P}_i^e$  are the conditional measures for  $M_s$  and  $M_e$  given that the initial state  $S_0$  is state  $i$ . The following simple fact will be quite useful. The proof is immediate from the nature of the conversion algorithm  $\zeta$ .

**Lemma 25.** *If  $M_s = (S, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{O})$  is a state-emitting HMM and  $M_e = \zeta(M_s)$ , then for any  $s_1^n \in \mathcal{S}^n$ ,  $x_1^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$  and state  $i$ :*

$$\mathbb{P}_i^s(S_1^n = s_1^n, X_1^n = x_1^n) = \mathbb{P}_i^e(S_1^n = s_1^n, X_0^{n-1} = x_1^n)$$

From this lemma it follows that the conversion algorithm  $\zeta$  preserves path-mergeability, that the distribution over future output from any state  $i$  is the same for a state-emitting HMM  $M_s$  and the corresponding edge-emitting HMM  $M_e = \zeta(M_s)$ , and also that the conditional state distributions  $\phi_i^s(w)$  and  $\phi_i^e(w)$  are equivalent for  $M_s$  and  $M_e$ . More precisely we have:

**Lemma 26.** *Let  $M_s$  be a state-emitting HMM, and let  $M_e = \zeta(M_s)$ .*

1. *For any state  $i$  and symbol sequence  $x_1^n$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_i^s(X_1^n = x_1^n) = \mathbb{P}_i^e(X_0^{n-1} = x_1^n)$ .*
2. *For any state  $i$  and symbol sequence  $x_1^n$  with  $\mathbb{P}_i^s(X_1^n = x_1^n) > 0$ ,  $\phi_i^s(x_1^n) = \phi_i^e(x_1^n)$ .*
3. *If  $M_s$  is path-mergeable then  $M_e$  is also path-mergeable.*

Using this Lemma we will now show that the edge-emitting results of Section 4 translate directly to state-emitting HMMS.

**Theorem 5.** *If  $M_s$  is a path-mergeable, state-emitting HMM, then  $h(n) \searrow h$  exponentially fast for its stationary output process  $\mathcal{P}^s = (X_t)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M_e = \zeta(M_s)$ . By Lemma 26  $M_e$  is also path-mergeable. Hence, by Theorem 4, the entropy rate estimates converge exponentially for its stationary output process  $\mathcal{P}^e$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}^s$  and  $\mathcal{P}^e$  are the same process (distributionally) the conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.** *Any path-mergeable, state-emitting HMM  $M_s$  a.s. forgets its initial condition at an exponential rate.*

*Proof.* Let  $M_e = \zeta(M_s)$ . By part 3 of Lemma 26  $M_e$  is also path-mergeable. Hence, by Theorem 3,  $M_e$  a.s. forgets its condition at an exponential rate. The conclusion follows immediately from this and parts 1 and 2 of Lemma 26.  $\square$

## 6 Discussion

The convergence speed of the entropy rate estimates  $h(n)$  and rate of memory loss in the initial condition are two important (and related) questions in the theory of HMMs. We have established here exponential bounds on both these quantities for finite HMMs with path-mergeable states. Below we discuss relations to work on related problems by others and also some simple extensions.

## 6.1 Related Work

The earliest major result on convergence of the entropy rate estimates  $h(n)$ , and our primary inspiration, is reference [14], which uses a coupling argument to prove an exponential bound on the rate of convergence for finite, functional HMMs with strictly positive state transition probabilities. Little else has been done directly on this problem till quite recently, though related results which easily imply an exponential rate of convergence for the estimates  $h(n)$  were also given earlier in [26] using a similar coupling argument, and shortly thereafter in [27] with an intuitively similar, but more direct, approach. The terms “loss of memory” or “forgetting the initial condition” were not used in this early literature [26, 27], but mathematically the estimates were of this type. However, the results given in these works were also only for (finite) state-emitting HMMs with strictly positive transition probabilities:  $\mathcal{T}_{ij} > 0$ , for all  $i, j$ .

Of course, if a finite Markov kernel  $\mathcal{T}$  is aperiodic then some power of it  $\mathcal{T}^n$  will be strictly positive. So, one may be tempted to think these early methods could easily be extended to aperiodic HMMs. But this is not as easy as it seems.

The difficulty arises with the HMM representation. For a finite, aperiodic HMM there always exists some length  $n$  such that it is possible to transition from each state  $i$  to each other state  $j$  in  $n$  steps, but it may not be possible to do so while emitting the same output sequence. And it is this fact that makes coupling arguments much more difficult.

Naturally, strict positivity of the observation matrix  $\mathcal{O}$  will rectify this problem. In this case, an aperiodic, state-emitting HMM with strictly positive observation matrix, a direct coupling argument for the block process can be applied to give exponential bounds as well.

We have established here, however, exponential convergence bounds under the weaker condition of path-mergeability, which does not require strict positivity of either  $\mathcal{O}$  or  $\mathcal{T}$ . Indeed, it is easy to see that for a finite state-emitting HMM path-mergeability is a strictly weaker condition than either (a) positivity of  $\mathcal{T}$  or (b) positivity of  $\mathcal{O}$  + aperiodicity. In fact, in the case of specifically finite HMMs path-mergeability is the weakest condition we are aware of for any results on loss of memory or convergence of the entropy rate estimates.

However, over the last few decades there has also been substantial work done on the rate of memory loss for HMMs in a variety of other (and often more general) settings [17–24]. Again primarily focusing on state-emitting models, but extending to  $\mathbb{R}^N$  valued (or more general) outputs, and often beyond a finite internal state set as well. In fact, sometimes even to continuous time as in [19, 22] and parts of [20]. The literature is too vast to accurately summarize all of, but good estimates of the rate of memory loss have been established in many instances with a variety of different methods: e.g., Lyapunov exponent theory and properties of the Birkhoff contraction coefficient and Hilbert projective metric.

Because of various differences in the models, it is difficult to compare many of these more recent results on memory loss to our own directly. However, we do note that much of this more recent work has also relied on strong positivity assumptions. For example, in [17] and parts of [18, 20] it is assumed that the Markov kernel  $\mathcal{T}$  is strictly positive (i.e., the conditional measure from each state has a strictly positive density with respect to some fixed reference measure) and in [17, 18, 20, 21, 24] it is assumed that the observation kernel  $\mathcal{O}$  is strictly positive (in the same sense). In the case that the observation kernel (but not the Markov transition kernel) is taken to be strictly positive and the state set is finite [18, 21], it is also assumed that Markov chain is aperiodic. Restricted, at least, to the case of finite HMMs, these are stronger assumptions than path-mergeability.

We should mention also, though, reference [23], where an exponential bound on the a.s. rate of memory loss is established without assuming strict positivity of either  $\mathcal{T}$  or  $\mathcal{O}$ . The authors were studying, generally, state-emitting HMMs with output space  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$  and internal state space  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ , where the kernels and invariant state distribution have densities with respect to some arbitrary reference measures. But, their framework covers the case of finite HMMs and, translated to the finite case, their assumption amounts to the following:

$$\text{There exists } i \in \mathcal{S} \text{ such that } \mathcal{T}_{ij} > 0, \text{ for all } j. \tag{8}$$

This mixing condition (8) is neither equivalent, strictly stronger, or strictly weaker than path-mergeability

for a finite, state-emitting HMM. Indeed, there exist simple examples of path-mergeable HMMs which do not satisfy this condition, but also HMMs which do satisfy this condition but are not path-mergeable. It can be shown, however, by an iterative construction similar to that used in the proof of Lemma 18, that if  $M_s$  is a finite, state-emitting HMM satisfying condition (8), and  $M_e = \zeta(M_s)$ , then  $M_e^n$  is state-collapsible for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . From this one may obtain (as shown in Sections 4 and 5) exponential bounds on both the rate of memory loss and convergence rate of the estimates  $h(n)$  for the HMM  $M_s$ .

## 6.2 Extensions

Path-mergeability is a sufficient condition for both exponential convergence of the entropy rate estimates and an exponential rate of memory loss. However, as discussed above, it is not a necessary one. Indeed, it seems likely that the entropy estimates  $h(n)$  converge exponentially for any finite HMM. Proving this in general may be difficult, but we give below one simple extension of path-mergeability to a more general condition where exponential convergence does hold.

Let us say two states  $i, j$  of a HMM are *incompatible* if there exists some length  $L$  such that the set of length- $L$  words which can be generated from state  $i$  and state  $j$  have no overlap. More precisely, if for each  $w$  with  $|w| = L$  we have either:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_i(X_0^{|w|-1} = w) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbb{P}_j(X_0^{|w|-1} = w) = 0 \quad (\text{or both}), \text{ for an edge-emitting HMM} \\ \mathbb{P}_i(X_1^{|w|} = w) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbb{P}_j(X_1^{|w|} = w) = 0 \quad (\text{or both}), \text{ for a state-emitting HMM} \end{aligned}$$

Consider the following condition:

$$\text{Each pair of states } i, j \text{ is either path-mergeable or incompatible.} \quad (9)$$

This condition (9) is clearly weaker than path-mergeability, but if an edge-emitting HMM satisfies this condition then it can be shown, by small modifications of the construction given in Lemma 18 for path-mergeable HMMs, that some power of it is also state-collapsible. From this one may obtain exponential bounds on convergence of the entropy rate estimates  $h(n)$  and rate of memory loss, as in Section 4. Analogous results hold for state-emitting HMMs satisfying (9) as well, since the standard conversion algorithm  $\zeta$  preserves both path-mergeability and incompatibility for each given pair of states  $i, j$ .

In fact, one can also use a weaker definition of incompatibility for state-emitting HMMs where the symbol  $X_0$  is included as part of  $w$  (i.e., apply the edge-emitting definition for state-emitting HMMs), and still have exponential convergence of the entropy rate estimate  $h(n)$  whenever (9) is satisfied. This does not follow immediately from the standard state-emitting to edge-emitting conversion  $\zeta$ , but if one runs the conversion in the other direction instead:

$$(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{O}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \{\mathcal{T}'^{(x)}\}) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{T}'_{ij}{}^{(x)} = \mathcal{T}_{ij} \mathcal{O}_{ix},$$

instead of  $\mathcal{T}'_{ij}{}^{(x)} = \mathcal{T}_{ij} \mathcal{O}_{jx}$ , then the property (9) is preserved under this conversion with the alternative state-emitting version of incompatibility including  $X_0$ . And, from this one may obtain the desired result.

If, however, there exist state pairs  $i, j$  that are not path-mergeable or incompatible (in any sense), then the situation becomes significantly more complicated. Coupling arguments, at least, are quite difficult in this case.

## Acknowledgments

The author thanks Jim Crutchfield for helpful discussions. This work was partially supported by ARO grant W911NF-12-1-0234 and VIGRE grant DMS0636297.

## References

- [1] E. J. Gilbert. On the identifiability problem for functions of finite Markov chains. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 30(3):688–697, 1959.
- [2] D. Blackwell and L. Koopmans. On the identifiability problem for functions of finite Markov chains. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 28(4):1011–1015, 1957.
- [3] D. Blackwell. The entropy of functions of finite-state Markov chains. In *Transactions of the first Prague conference on information theory, statistical decision functions, random processes*, pages 13–20. Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, 1957.
- [4] B. H. Juang and L. R. Rabiner. Hidden Markov models for speech recognition. *Technometrics*, 33(3):251–272, 1991.
- [5] L. R. Rabiner. A tutorial on hidden Markov models and selected applications in speech recognition. *IEEE Proc.*, 77:257–286, 1989.
- [6] L. R. Bahl, F. Jelinek, and R. L. Mercer. A maximum likelihood approach to continuous speech recognition. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, PAMI-5:179–190, 1983.
- [7] F. Jelinek. Continuous speech recognition by statistical methods. *Proc. IEEE*, 64:532–536, 1976.
- [8] A. Siepel and D. Haussler. Combining phylogenetic and hidden Markov models in biosequence analysis. *J. Comp. Bio.*, 11(2-3):413–428, 2004.
- [9] S. R. Eddy. Profile hidden Markov models. *Bioinformatics*, 14(9):755–763, 1998.
- [10] K. Karplus, C. Barrett, and R. Hughey. Hidden Markov models for detecting remote protein homologies. *Bioinformatics*, 14(10):846–856, 1998.
- [11] S. R. Eddy, G. Mitchison, and R. Durbin. Maximum discrimination hidden Markov models of sequence consensus. *J. Comp. Bio.*, 2(1):9–23, 1995.
- [12] P. Baldi, Y. Chauvin, T. Hunkapiller, and M. A. McClure. Hidden Markov models of biological primary sequence information. *PNAS*, 91:1059–1063, 1994.
- [13] J. P. Crutchfield and D. P. Feldman. Regularities unseen, randomness observed: Levels of entropy convergence. *CHAOS*, 13(1):25–54, 2003.
- [14] J. Birch. Approximations for the entropy for functions of Markov chains. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 33(3):930–938, 1962.
- [15] N. F. Travers and J. P. Crutchfield. Exact synchronization for finite-state sources. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 145(5):1181–1201, 2011.
- [16] N. F. Travers and J. P. Crutchfield. Asymptotic synchronization for finite-state sources. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 145(5):1202–1223, 2011.
- [17] R. B. Sowers and A. M. Makowski. Discrete-time filtering for linear systems in correlated noise with non-gaussian initial conditions: Formulas and asymptotics. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 37:114–121, 1992.
- [18] R. Atar and O. Zeitouni. Lyapunov exponents for finite state nonlinear filtering. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 35:36–55, 1995.
- [19] D. Ocone and E. Pardoux. Asymptotic stability of the optimal filter with respect to its initial condition. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 34:226–243, 1996.

- [20] R. Atar and O. Zeitouni. Exponential stability for nonlinear filtering. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Prob. Statist.*, 33(6):697–725, 1997.
- [21] F. Le Gland and L. Mevel. Exponential forgetting and geometric ergodicity in hidden Markov models. *Math. Control Signals Systems*, 13:63–93, 2000.
- [22] P. Baxendale, P. Chigansky, and R. Liptser. Asymptotic stability of the Wonham filter: ergodic and nonergodic signals. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 43:643–669, 2002.
- [23] P. Chigansky and R. Lipster. Stability of nonlinear filters in nonmixing case. *Ann. App. Prob.*, 14(4):2038–2056, 2004.
- [24] R. Douc, G. Fort, E. Moulines, and P. Priouret. Forgetting the initial distribution for hidden Markov models. *Stoch. Proc. App.*, 119(4):1235–1256, 2009.
- [25] P. Collet and F. Leonardi. Loss of memory of hidden Markov models and Lyapunov exponents. *arXiv/0908.0077*, 2009.
- [26] T. E. Harris. On chains of infinite order. *Pacific J. Math.*, 5:707–724, 1955.
- [27] L.E. Baum and T. Petrie. Statistical inference for probabilistic functions of finite state Markov chains. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 37(6):1554–1563, 1966.